



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,406	11/26/2003	Ronald A. Katz	6046-101D11	1054
7590 Telebuyer, LLC Suite 315 9220 Sunset Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90069			EXAMINER WOO, STELLA L	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/12/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/724,406

Applicant(s)

KATZ, RONALD A.

Examiner

Stella L. Woo

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17-27, 29-42, 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shavit et al. (US 4,799,156, hereinafter "Shavit") in view of Lockwood (US 5,576,951) for the same reasons applied in the last Office action and repeated below.

Regarding claims 17, 22, 24, 26-27, 29, Shavit discloses an electronic commercial transaction system (interactive market management system) for selectively enabling communication between members of plural groups (buyers 82, suppliers 84, distributors 83, etc.), comprising:

an interface (communications interface 79 permits on-line computer access by remote buyers 82 with market participants, such as sellers 83, 84, 86, 88, 94, 96, etc.; col. 5, line 39.- col. 6, line 51);

an active buyer terminal (personal computers 62, 64 allow remote buyers to designate the particular goods or service desired via a request for quotation (RFQ); col. 25, lines 28-33; col. 5, lines 43-47; col. 6, lines 39-51);

memory storage (system 50 maintains user profiles for every user, col. 9, lines 52-68, and stores and logs every operation for each user ID, col. 11, lines 22-29));

whereby the control system subsequently electronically outputs by electronic mail to an indicated email address for electronic email communication relating to the interested buyer, an indication regarding said area of interest (system 50 provides email messages to each user, including bids in response to requests for particular goods or services input by the user, promotions, and other information of particular interest to buyers; col. 11, lines 52 – col. 12, line 26; col. 13, lines 25-27; col. 18, lines 44-49; col. 20, lines 2-39) as communicated via the public telephone system (the communication links may be any of a wide variety of network services, including public telephone network; col. 5, lines 51-55).

Shavit differs from claims 17, 22, 24, 26-27, 29 in that it does not teach selectively determining a vendor and providing video data for display by an active buyer terminal in accordance with types of merchandise and/or services relating to areas of interest. However, Lockwood teaches the desirability of having a central processor 222 select an appropriate vendor-supplied data source associated with the customer's request, col. 18, lines 51-54; col. 19, lines 52-53; col. 20, lines 36-39, for output to the customer as a high-resolution audio-visual presentation; col. 18, lines 9-56; col. 19, lines 13-24, 52-57) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such vendor and video selection, as taught by Lockwood, within the system of Shavit in order to provide buyers with a more efficient means of selecting goods and services from a plurality of vendors by providing customized audio/video presentations

from select vendors based on the buyer's area of interest. In this way, the buyer need not manually select each distributor from which information is desired and can receive information from a plurality of vendors rather than be restricted to vendors already known to the buyer.

Regarding claims 18-19, 21, the examiner takes Official Notice that merchandise are known to be identified by a product code such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such use of a numerical product code to identify the particular merchandise within the combination of Shavit and Lockwood.

Regarding claims 20 and 30, Shavit allow for direct communication over a switched line between a buyer and vendor via telephone conversation (col. 7, line 58 - col. 8, line 4) or online communication (col. 14, line 63 – col. 15, line 4).

Regarding claim 23, Shavit provides for receiving a user-ID and password (col. 18, lines 27-31). The examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to use a check digit to confirm correct entry of a password such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such use of a check digit within the combination of Shavit and Lockwood.

Regarding claim 25, Shavit provides for processing invoices (col. 16, lines 37-49).

Regarding claim 31, Shavit provides for a printer (col. 9, lines 39-41).

The steps recited in method claims 32-42, 44-46 are carried out by the system of Shavit in view of Lockwood as described above with regard to claims 17-27, 29-31.

3. Claims 28 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shavit and Lockwood, as applied to claims 17 and 32 above, and further in view of Kaye et al. (US 5,727,164, hereinafter "Kaye") for the same reasons applied in the last Office action and repeated below.

The combination of Shavit and Lockwood differs from claims 28 and 43 in that it does not specify the buyer data as including a maximum amount that the buyer is willing to pay. However, Kaye teaches the desirability of allowing a buyer to specify a maximum purchase price as part of the desired product information (col. 4, lines 11-20; col. 5, line 53 - col. 6, line 2) in order to locate a vendor willing to sell the desired product at a minimum cost. Since the combination of Shavit and Lockwood is similarly directed to providing buyers with access to multiple vendors, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to allow a buyer to include a desired purchase price as part of the buyer request, as taught by Kaye, within the combination of Shavit and Lockwood in order to locate a vendor willing to sell the desired product at a desired purchase price.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Shavit provides no reason that would lead one of ordinary skill to combine the two references in the manner that the Examiner suggests." However, both systems address obtaining quotations from different vendors. In Shavit, a buyer must identify the vendors from which quotations are requested. Lockwood

saves a buyer time by automatically obtaining quotations from several vendors without requiring a buyer to specify particular vendors (col. 2, lines 8-30). In this way, the buyer need not manually select each distributor from which information is desired and can easily receive information from a plurality of vendors rather than be restricted to vendors already known to the buyer.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella L. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stella L. Woo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614